



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 15, 2004

Ms. Luz E. Sandoval-Walker  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of El Paso  
2 Civic Center Plaza, 9th Floor  
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2004-7899

Dear Ms. Sandoval-Walker:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 212097.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for copies of all complaints and reports filed with the El Paso Police Department involving a specific person since December 2003, including any reports concerning incidents at a restaurant in January of 2004. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted documents include complaint affidavits. It is unclear whether these affidavits have been presented to a magistrate. Article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure states "[t]he arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, is public information." Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.26. Article 15.04 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that "[t]he affidavit made before the magistrate or district or county attorney is called a 'complaint' if it charges the commission of an offense." Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.04. Case law indicates that a complaint can support the issuance of an arrest warrant. *See Janecka v. State*, 739 S.W.2d 813, 822-23 (Tex. Crim. App. 1987); *Villegas v. State*, 791 S.W.2d 226, 235 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 1990, pet. ref'd); *Borsari v. State*, 919 S.W.2d 913, 918 (Tex. App.—Houston [14 Dist.] 1996, pet. ref'd) (discussing well-established principle that complaint in support of arrest warrant need not contain same particularity required of

indictment). To the extent that the submitted complaint affidavits were presented to the magistrate, the city must release them pursuant to article 15.26. We will address the exceptions you claim for the remaining submitted information.

Next, section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This exception encompasses the common-law right to privacy. Information must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy when the information is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. See *Industrial Found. v. Texas Ind. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). When a law enforcement agency compiles criminal history information that pertains to a particular individual, the compiled information takes on a character that implicates that individual's right to privacy in a manner that the same information in an uncompiled state does not. See *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989); see also Open Records Decision No. 616 at 2-3 (1993). A request for information about a specific incident or offense, however, does not require the law enforcement agency to compile an individual's criminal history and thus does not implicate the individual's privacy as contemplated in *Reporters Committee*. Furthermore, law enforcement records in which the individual is depicted as a complainant, witness, or involved party other than a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant do not constitute records of the criminal history of the individual and thus are not protected by common-law privacy as contemplated in *Reporters Committee*. For these reasons, we find that the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You also raise section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108, the "law enforcement exception," provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of 552.021 if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation or prosecution of crime; [or] (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Generally, a governmental body claiming an exception under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(b)(1); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the remaining submitted information relates to a pending investigation. Based on your representation, we agree that the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or

prosecution of crime. See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ *ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

We note, however, that section 552.108 is inapplicable to basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information and any complaint affidavit submitted to the magistrate in support of an arrest warrant, we conclude that the city may withhold the remaining submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1).<sup>1</sup> We note that you have the discretion to release all or part of this information that is not otherwise confidential by law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

---

<sup>1</sup>Because we are able to make a determination under sections 552.101 and 552.108, we need not address your additional argument against disclosure.

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



L. Joseph James  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 212097

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Chris M. Borunda  
Ray, Valdez, McChristian & Jeans  
5822 Cromo Drive  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)